UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,043	07/07/2003	Antero Irri	0101/0022	4699

21395 7590 11/02/2005

LOUIS WOO
LAW OFFICE OF LOUIS WOO
717 NORTH FAYETTE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
TOLAN, EDWARD THOMAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3725	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/613,043	IRRI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Edward Tolan	3725	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 August 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *12-16 and 24-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *12-16 and 24-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5-12-05, 7-13-05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 12,25-28 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tsuneda et al. (EP 0913236). Tsuneda discloses a programmable robot (1) that is arranged to grip a sheet metal wafer workpiece (20) with a gripper (4), deliver the workpiece to a positioning means (8) and further deliver the workpiece to a processing means (6). A transfer means (2) moves on slide (21) to take the robot to different locations (5,6) along a given path. Location (5) is a storage location and location (6) is a processing means. The positioning means (8) and the robot (1) are together placed on the transfer means (2) and movable therewith. Tsuneda discloses that the processing means are photo lithography, deposition and etching means, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of invention to transfer workpieces using the means of Tsuneda to other known processing means (coating, machining, cutting) that are used to work on metal workpieces. Regarding claim 26, gravity effects the workpiece, in column 5, lines 40-50 Tsuneda discloses a suction means for positioning the workpiece as the positioning means (8) ascends.

Claims 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Prunotto et al. (5,187,958). Prunotto discloses a bending press for metal sheet comprising an automated manipulator device (G), a transfer device (28) and a position and centering device (S1,S2,46). The manipulator delivers the workpiece to the positioning device, the workpiece is positioned and then the workpiece is delivered to the bending press (column 5, lines 42-65). The positioning device is movable along track (22) by transfers means (column 5, lines 18-24) along a common predetermined path (axis Y, column 4, lines 14-19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuneda et al. (EP 0913236) in view of Kato (5,161,936). Tsuneda does not disclose a plurality of transfer means. Kato teaches a plurality of transfer means (7,8,8') that operate on a common slide. The transfer means are controllable for coordinated movement. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide multiple transfer means and robots in the invention of Tsuneda as taught by Kato in order to speed production. Regarding claim 14 Tsuneda states in paragraph

[0018] that the positioning means is formed to be movable independently of the transfer means (2) and arm (3) in order to position it relatively.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuneda et al (5,004,399) in view of Sartorio (4,806,071). Tsuneda does not disclose double blank detection. Sartorio teaches that it is known to position sensors (60,61) to detect a number of blanks that are transferred. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide Tsuneda with blank detecting sensors as taught by Sartorio in order to determine if there is more than one workpiece gripped by the robot.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuneda et al. (EP 0913236) in view of Kato (5,161,936) and further in view of Sartorio (4,806,071). Tsuneda in view of Kato does not disclose double blank detection. Sartorio teaches that it is known to position sensors (60,61) to detect a number of blanks that are transferred. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide Tsuneda in view of Kato with blank detecting sensors as taught by Sartorio in order to determine if there is more than one workpiece gripped by the robot.

Claims 24 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuneda et al. (EP 0913236) in view of Prunotto et al. (5,187,958). Tsuneda does not disclose that the robot transfers a workpiece to a bending machine. Prunotto teaches a robot gripper (G) that transfers a workpiece to a bending machine. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use the robot

gripper of Tsuneda to transfer workpieces to other processing centers as taught by Prunotto.

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prunotto et al. (5,187,958) in view of Sartorio (4,735,079). Prunotto does not disclose that the workpiece is effected by gravity (the workpiece is gripped at all times). Sartorio teaches that a centering and position means (16,18) is used wherein a gripper lays a workpiece on the support (18). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to lay the workpiece of Prunotto on a positioning and centering means as taught by Sartorio for single axis positioning of the workpiece.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Ed Tolan whose telephone number is 571-272-4525.

ED TOLAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER